

Also, my complaint had nothing to do with Extell Development yet your letter stated that it did.

What I have decided to do was limit my complaint to the corruption that I was subjected to by seventeen justices of the New York State Judicial System. The corruption was criminal and happened in Manhattan, which would mean that it would be a matter for the Manhattan District Attorney's Office.

...  
While judges are immune from prosecution for mistakes they are not immune from prosecution for criminal activity such as what happened here.

In the website Judges from the New York State Judicial System are shown rewriting the description of my Unit and other Judges are shown doing nothing to stop it after I refused a threat by Justice Friedman that I agree to sell my unit back to the co-op corp. or waive my rights to build for the \$500,000 offered by the co-op corp.

When judges in Manhattan make or permit knowingly wrong decisions, that is a corruption. Here it is impossible to believe that these judges believed their decisions were true thus it's a crime. As will be proven in the website, the case was "fixed" and warrants investigation from the District Attorney's Office since the actions of these Judges was done with the criminal intent of seizing the development rights that all these Judges fully understood were part of the Brady's Unit.

**D. In reply, the District Attorney's Office's Chief "Public Integrity Unit," Daniel G. Cort, replied on March 9, 2012 with the following:**

I am writing to inform you that we have received your letters dated March 5, 2012, and March 8, 2012, regarding the transferable development rights that were denied to you and the judicial corruption that you allege.

After reviewing the information provided in your latest correspondence, including a review of the documents contained on the website [www.blackrobecrime.com](http://www.blackrobecrime.com), ***I have decided to uphold the Office's original decision not to initiate a criminal investigation.*** I believe that you have provided to new information that would support opening up a criminal investigation.

I hope that this can be resolved to your satisfaction through other channels.

Daniel G. Cort  
Assistant District Attorney Chief, Public Integrity Unit

**E. The Assistant District Attorney Chief, Public Integrity Unit was obstructing justice by covering-up for Justice Renwick and the First Department Judges**

150. There was no need for a big “investigation.” I did not ask them for an investigation. I asked them to ask the Appellate Division Justices, including Dianne Renwick, a single question: by what line or reasoning or legal authority did the judges rewrite the description of my unit?

151. The District Attorney knew that Justice Renwick and the Appellate Division judges had illegally seized my rights by unilaterally and *without judicial authority or reasoning*, rewriting the words of my contract.

152. Justice Dianne Renwick of the Appellate Division, First Department is married to Bronx District Attorney Robert Johnson. Justice Renwick was one of the judges who unlawfully rewrote the description of my unit and defrauded me of millions of dollars worth of air rights. Robert Johnson sits on the Commission on Judicial Conduct, the agency that refused to find any wrongdoing in Justice Friedman’s actions. The Manhattan DA would have known this. Their failure to take action in the face of such corruption makes them accomplices in this cover-up.

153. By not addressing this question, the District Attorney’s Office ignored a major case of judicial corruption and fraud.

F. On December 26, 2013, I wrote an investigator at the Special Prosecutions Bureau of the Manhattan District Attorney’s Office

I am enclosing a copy of a complaint that I filed on December 17, 2013 with the Moreland Commission on Public Corruption and the Commission on Judicial Conduct. I am not including the exhibits in my letter to you at this time. Since the complaint is criminal in nature, I am now demanding an investigation be conducted by the Manhattan District Attorney’s Office.

My complaint is that the Manhattan Supreme Court justice, and five Appellate Division, First Department justices, engaged in case fixing, meaning that Supreme Court Justice Marcy Friedman communicated with the Appellate Division justices prior to their February 11, 2010 decision, and conspired as to the outcome of their decision.

154. One of the Appellate Division justices who engaged in this criminal conduct is Justice Diane T. Renwick, who is married to the Bronx District Attorney Robert Johnson (who is himself a member of the Moreland Commission, to whom I had reported the criminal seizure of my rights by the justices of the Supreme and Appellate Courts).

**G. I contacted the Manhattan District Attorney's Office numerous times in early 2014 telling them to closely follow the two cases I had filed against Sherwood Equities and 450 West Owners Corp. because it involved \$100 million of air rights and there was a clear pattern of judicial misconduct.**

155. On January 16, 2014, I wrote them:

In a February 11, 2010 Decision, the five Appellate Division, First Department Justices, including Dianne Renwick, who is married to Bronx District Attorney Robert Johnson, took out the words "to the extent that may from time to time be permitted under applicable law," and replaced them with the words "that can be built without the use of the building's development rights."

The blatant rewriting was done with the criminal intent of voiding the very rights that were given through the 7<sup>th</sup> paragraph footnote to the schedule of units. These rights were worth at least \$500 per square foot, which equals \$95,000,000. I demand that they be prosecuted for what they did or that they provide you with a believable explanation of why they believed they were entitled to rewrite the paragraph. Investigations into criminal wrongdoings cannot stop at the entrance to the courthouse.

156. On February 25, 2014, I followed-up giving them the case numbers so they could keep an eye on the ongoing litigation:

The original letter I sent to you is enclosed. There are currently two ongoing cases in the New York Supreme Court. The case numbers are 157779/2013 and 654226/2013.

You should be following this case closely as it involves \$100,000,000 worth of development rights. It also involves numerous Supreme Court Justices' illegal actions.

157. On April 24, 2014, I again contacted the Manhattan District Attorney informing them of the conflicts of interests between members of the judiciary and the agencies charged with overseeing wrongdoing by judges.

In the past 5 months I have made a complaint specifically about Bronx District Attorney Robert Johnson's wife Dianne Renwick, who is an Appellate Division Justice in the First Department. That department covers Manhattan and the Bronx.

Specifically my charge is that Justice Renwick engaged in criminal activity when she, along with three other Justices from the First department blatantly rewrote the description of my unit in a commercial coop so that it would no longer include the right to have the utilization of the 190,000 square feet of development rights that were given to the premises pursuant to the 2005 rezoning of the area with the creation of the Hudson Yards District in Manhattan. These rights have a value of at least \$80 million dollars and they were unlawfully seized and sold by the other shareholders of the co-op corporation with the help of Justice Renwick.

The Manhattan District Attorney's indifference and cover up of the actions of the Bronx District Attorney's wife's criminal conduct will be exposed if this office does not take appropriate action.

158. *The Manhattan District Attorney never replied to these letters in 2014.* The District Attorney would not ask the judges by what authority did the justices of this state rewrite the unambiguous contract voiding the rights conveyed – the one sure test proving corruption, because that would unravel the entire façade, as happened at the March 18, 2014 hearing.

**H. In a Continuation of the Same Pattern, the Office of the Inspector General Ignored My Complaint and Referred Me to the Commission on Judicial Conduct**

April 2012

The Office of the State Inspector General is in receipt of your email dated March 7, 2012.

Upon review, it has been determined that this matter might be more appropriately addressed by the NYS Commission of Judicial Conduct. To pursue this matter further you may wish to contact the agency directly at the NYS Commission of Judicial Conduct, Corning Tower, Suite 2301, Empire State Plaza, Albany, New York 12223.

Thank you for your email.

Rachel S. Pauley  
Special Investigative Counsel

159. The Inspector General is supposed to investigate, including allegations of corruption that may implicate the Commission on Judicial Conduct itself. By washing it hand of

the information provided, the Inspector General failed to investigate a major case of corruption and fraud. Instead, I was directed to the same corrupt agency where cases go to die – the CJC.

160. On April 24, 2012, I replied to Rachel Pauley with the following letter explaining the extent of the corruption her office failed to investigate:

Dear Ms. Pauley

I am responding to your attached letter.

I was very disappointed by your letter and need to address some of the incorrect comments that you made.

Respectfully but frankly I must say that I feel you were clearly are trying to avoid dealing with the Judicial wrongdoing and crimes that you were made aware of from my website. I provided clear and convincing proof of Judicial misconduct, which at the very least you yourself should have forwarded to the Commission on Judicial Conduct.

Second, your letter states that you only deal with positions appointed by the Governor. Well according to the Commission on Judicial Conduct website " Appellate Court Justices are appointed by the Governor from among the ranks of the elected Supreme Court Justices" the Court of Appeals Justices are also selected by the Governor thus these are people that you would surely have an obligation to investigate when charges of corruption a bought to your attention. That is your job.

I want you to know that the FBI, The United State Justice Department, and the NYPD are all still investigating the charges. I hope that you now realize that your organization must also address this issue and not try to sweep it under the rug. This issue is surely something you have an obligation to address.

Please feel free to email me with any other information you might need.

Sincerely

James Brady

**I. I Submitted Another Complaint in February 2015 to the Manhattan District Attorney That Was Also Ignored**

**IX. The New York State Attorney General's Office Engaged in a Pattern of Deliberate Indifference and Evasiveness to Evidence of Judicial Criminal Fraudulence and Violation of my Constitutional Rights**

161. New York Attorney General Eric T. Schneiderman ran his re-election campaign on the promise that the laws of New York applied to all citizens equally, not just the very rich; the “People's Lawyer” he said, and he has since made much of the need to apply and follow One Rule – one rule for both the rich and powerful and the common man. Yet when presented with a clear example judicial corruption: the defrauding of \$100 million dollars worth of air rights conveyed through an Offering Plan by the systematic rewriting of the contract in order to void the very rights being conveyed – the New York Attorney General engaged in evasive silence and completely disregarded the substance and words of my correspondence.

A. On June 13, 2011, the New York State Attorney General, Eric Schneiderman, replied to evidence of corruption and criminal conduct of named state judges by regretting “we cannot be of more assistance to you at this time.”

The Office of the Attorney General of the State of New York has received the above-reference complaint which has been forwarded to the Real Estate finance Bureau of this Office. The Department of law has jurisdiction only over the initial offering of real estate securities, such as cooperatives, condominiums, homeowner associations and time-sharing interests, and matters which may relate directly to such offerings.

The dispute stated within your complaint is currently in litigation. *The Attorney General's Office does not review matters once they have been presented to a court.* The judicial process maintains independent review procedures, including but not limited to the appeal process.

We regret that we cannot be of more assistance to you at this time.

B. At the Start of the Litigation with Sherwood and the Co-op, I Again Sent Notice to the Attorney General that going forward, they must keep an eye on the existing cases in the likely event that another unlawful act be committed as part of this conspiracy

162. My January 13, 2014 letter revealed that “a very serious matter involving case fixing of multiple Appellate Division Justices” had occurred, and that his office must investigate

the matter and not dismiss such blatant corruption done with deliberate criminal intent, as well as a violation of my constitutional rights.

**C. The New York Attorney General's "Public Integrity Bureau" replied with an unsigned letter on February 24, 2014**

On behalf of Attorney General Eric C. Schneiderman, I thank you for the information you provided to our office dated December 17, 2013.

The Public Integrity Bureau has carefully reviewed your correspondence and has determined that your complaint does not warrant action by this office at this time.

163. Thus, informed of past criminal conduct on the part of the state judiciary, and being warned of the potential for further misconduct, the New York State Attorney General's Public Integrity Bureau failed to act and covered over the crimes of the state's judges.

164. The depraved indifference and the pattern of willful evasion by the State Attorney General is evidence of corruption, and of going along and facilitating the criminal seizure of my rights. The AG was an accomplice to this crime through its failure to execute its stated mission to investigate crimes committed under color of state law.

165. The Attorney General treated my case as an appeal from a disgruntled litigant rather than a case of judicial corruption. The Attorney General would not ask the simple one-sentence question that unravels the duplicity and deliberate criminal intent of the judges who rewrote the description of my Unit for the benefit of a powerful New York real estate developer.

**X. Governor Andrew Cuomo was Complicit in Facilitating the Criminal Rewriting of my Contract by Failing to Investigate the Case**

166. In 2013, Governor Andrew M. Cuomo appointed the "Commission to Investigate Public Corruption" under the Moreland Act and Executive Law Section 63(8). The Commission was charged with, among other duties, to oversee and strengthen "the criminal statutes for corruption and misconduct by public officials, such as bribery laws."

**A. December 2013: I Contact the Moreland Commission to Investigate Public Corruption**

167. On December 17 2013, I sent the Moreland Commission the same letter I sent the Commission on Judicial Conduct (*Supra*). I followed-up with letters on December 30, 2014, and January 2014 giving them the same case information I provided the CJC.

168. On February 24, 2014, the Commission to Investigate Public Corruption replied by stating:

[Our] staff has determined that your matter would be more appropriately addressed by the New York Commission on Judicial Conduct. The CJC has the authority to investigate potentially improper activities by members of the New York judiciary. Therefore, we have forwarded your complaint to their office for review.

169. Five weeks after receiving this letter, Governor Cuomo disbanded the Moreland Commission. We now know that at this same time, the Moreland Commission was investigating a tax abatement sweetheart deal arranged by Sheldon Silver for major Manhattan developer Gary Barnett of Extell Development Corp. Those tax credits were worth \$35 million. The air rights seized from my Unit were worth three times that.

170. One of the Moreland Commission members is Bronx District Attorney Robert Johnson. He is also the husband of Appellate Division Justice Dianne Renwick, who is one of the justices who unlawfully rewrote the contract describing my apartment. This means one of the principals charged with investigating judicial corruption is married to one of the justices engaged in the corruption. Johnson of course knew of what was happening in my case while his wife stripped me of my rights.

171. The Moreland Commission followed in the same pattern of deceit and corruption by referring me to the Commission on Judicial Conduct, where my claims would be buried and dismissed by the corrupt judges and Members who have asserted, repeatedly, that they see no

wrongdoing in the judicial rewriting of an unambiguous contract in order to deprive the Unit owner of the most valuable asset under the contract.

**B. Contacting Governor Andrew Cuomo in 2014**

On April 28, 2014, I wrote Governor Cuomo the following:

I am enclosing a copy of a letter that I sent to the Manhattan District Attorney, dated April 24, 2014, which included a copy of a letter sent to the Commission on Judicial Conduct dated April 23, 2014.

You are the governor, you are the highest authority in the State of New York, and you need to take action when you are told about corruption within your State.

As you will see, I provided overwhelming evidence of judicial misconduct and I'm demanding that you take appropriate action. To be clear, I need you to recommend that the Justices listed in this complaint be removed to protect the citizens of this State from these Justice's corruption.

172. Governor Cuomo not only failed to take any action on this matter, but neither he nor his office bothered responding to my letters.

173. Cuomo had been attorney general when I first contacted that office to expose the criminal conduct of the state judges who rewrote the description to my commercial co-op unit. As attorney general, Cuomo would have known and had access to the Offering Plan and all surrounding documents, and that I had been defrauded of my rights under the contract that his office is sworn to enforce as written.

**SUMMARY**

174. Defendants were given a long list of corruption red flags that they ignored, which makes them as corrupt and complicit in the violation of my rights as the judges. The role of Defendants was to actively do nothing; to pretend they saw no wrongdoing and just go along with the corruption and deceit.

175. First Corruption Red Flag: The justices were relentlessly corrupt in denying that paragraph seven conveys air rights to my unit when that is what it says on its face, and no alternative meaning exists, and no one ever offered an alternative meaning.

176. Second Corruption Red Flag: Rewriting the paragraph and surrounding the paragraph with their own terms and conditions which were clearly meant to void the right given through the contract.

177. Third Corruption Red Flag: Refusing to even admit what paragraph seven is. No judge ever called the Seventh Paragraph Footnote to the Schedule of Units of the Amended and Final Offering Plan (converting the building to co-operative ownership) by its proper name or referred to its proper context, which would make its meaning and intent more difficult to dispute.

178. Fourth Corruption Red Flag: Even after the defendants admit the meaning and intent is to give my unit the right to have the premise's development rights, the judges alone refuse to admit this fact.

179. Fifth Corruption Red Flag: Falsifying the issue before them.

180. Sixth Corruption Red Flag: Ignoring undisputed expert testimony that says the paragraph conveys air rights to the 12<sup>th</sup> Floor and Roof apartment.

181. Seventh Corruption Red Flag: Refusing to admit the meaning of their own words.

182. Eight Corruption Red Flag: Refusing to explain the line of reasoning or legal authority that was used to rewrite the description of my apartment.

183. Ninth Corruption Red Flag: Taking out 37 words from a February 11, 2010 Appellate Division, First Department decision that affirmed my rights.

184. Tenth Corruption Red Flag: Making-up false reasons to place sanctions on me.